

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/617,067	07/16/2000	Daniel T. Papalia	EN11111	7220		
7590 12/02/2003			EXAMINER			
Motorola Energy Systems Group			BORISSOV	BORISSOV, IGOR N		
Intellectual Property Department 1700 Belle Meade Court Lawrenceville, GA 30043			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3629			
			DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·		Application No.		Applicant(s)	R
Office Action Summary		09/617,067		PAPALIA ET AL.	
		Examiner		Art Unit	
		Igor Borissov		3629	•
The MAILING DA Period for Reply	TE of this communication ap	pears on the cover s	heet with the co	orrespondence addre	SS
THE MAILING DATE OI - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the lifthe period for reply specified in If NO period for reply is specified. - Failure to reply within the set on Any reply received by the Office earned patent term adjustment. Status	.,	.136(a). In no event, however ply within the statutory minim d will apply and will expire SI te, cause the application to b ng date of this communicatio	er, may a reply be time um of thirty (30) days X (6) MONTHS from t ecome ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timely. he mailing date of this comm 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.
	ommunication(s) filed on <u>22</u>				
2a) This action is FIN	/—	his action is non-fina			
	ation is in condition for allow ance with the practice unde				nerits is
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-8</u> 8	and 10-22 is/are pending in	the application.			
4a) Of the above of	laim(s) is/are withdra	awn from considerat	ion.		
5) Claim(s) is	are allowed.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-8 a</u>	nd 10-22 is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is	are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) ar Application Papers	e subject to restriction and/	or election requirem	ent.		
9)☐ The specification is	objected to by the Examin	er.			
10) The drawing(s) file	d on is/are: a)□ acco	epted or b) objected	I to by the Exan	niner.	
Applicant may not	request that any objection to t	he drawing(s) be held	in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11) The proposed draw	ving correction filed on	_ is: a)∏ approved	b) disapprov	ed by the Examiner.	
If approved, correct	ted drawings are required in re	eply to this Office actio	n.		
12) The oath or declara	ation is objected to by the E	xaminer.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§	119 and 120				
13) Acknowledgment	is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 L	J.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some	* c)☐ None of:				
1. Certified co	pies of the priority documen	ts have been receive	ed.		
2. Certified co	pies of the priority documen	ts have been receive	ed in Applicatio	n No	
applicat	e certified copies of the pridical prior ion from the International Betailed Office action for a lis	ureau (PCT Rule 17	.2(a)).		ge
14) Acknowledgment is	made of a claim for domes	tic priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(e)) (to a provisional ap	plication).
·	n of the foreign language pr made of a claim for domes	* *			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (Notice of Draftsperson's Pate Information Disclosure State	ent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) 🔲 N		(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-15	
.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01)	Office A	ction Summary		Part of Paper No. 8	

Art Unit: 3629

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 2, it is confusing, because it reffers to a system while claiming a method step.

Claims 4-8 are rejected as being dependent from claim 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chasek (US 5,237,507) in view of Edelman et al. (US 6,281,601).

Chasek teaches a system and method for developing real-time economic incentives to encourage efficient use of the resources of a regulated electric utility, comprising:

As per claims 1-2, 10 and 20,

- a plurality of power macnines (column 2, lines 3-9; column 3, lines 51-54);

Art Unit: 3629

- a remote means for actuating the power machines comprising a means for monitoring a market price of electricity (column 3, line 29 through column 5, line 58); a means for monitoring a market price of hydrocarbon fuels (column 3, line 29 through column 5, line 58); a means for calculating the difference between the market price of electricity and the market price of hydrocarbon fuels (column 3, line 29 through column 5, line 58).

Chasek does not specifically teach for a means for actuating a power machine.

Edelman et al. teach a system and method for a distributed generation power networking system comprising a turbogenerator which is controlled (turned on and off) by a controller (column 1, line 56 through column 2, line 5), wherein said controller evaluates local data (column 6, lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chasek to include means for actuating a power machine incuding a controller for evaluating local data, because it would enhance the performance and accuracy of the system by evaluating the local conditions, thereby make it more attractive to the customers.

As per claim 4, Chasek teaches said system and method wherein the actuation signal comprises a remote override signal causing the power machine to turn on or turn off (column 4, line 13 through column 5, line 58).

As per claim 5, Chasek teaches said system and method, further comprising a means for reading data from a meter (column 3, lines 51-57).

Art Unit: 3629

As per claim 6, Edelman et al. teach said system and method, further comprising a means for reading data related to the operational performance of the power machine (column 1, line 56 through column 7, line 64).

As per claim 7, Chasek teaches said system and method, further comprising a means for reading the local energy rate structure (column 3, line 42 through column 4, line 36).

As per claim 8, Chasek teaches said system and method, further comprising a means to calculate the load demand and to print and prepare a billing statement (column 3, line 58 through column 5, line 23).

As per claim 11, Chasek teaches said system and method, further comprising a means for aggregating power to sell on a power market (column 4, line 13-22).

As per claim 12, Chasek teaches said system and method, further comprising a means for generating a billing statement (column 4, line 13-22).

As per claim 13, Chasek teaches said system and method wherein the electricity generation factor is selected from the group consisting of market rate structure, peak shaving information, load shedding information and information relating to the ability to sell power to the grid (column 4, line 13-22).

As per claim 14, Chasek teaches said system and method wherein the system operates in an environment selected from the group consisting of a traditional environment, a transitional environment, and a competitive environment (column 3, line 58 through column 5, line 57).

Art Unit: 3629

As per claim 15, Chasek teaches said system and method, further comprising a means to calculate the load demand and to print and prepare a billing statement (column 3, line 58 through column 5, line 23).

As per claim 16, Chasek teaches said system and method, further comprising a means for selling power to the grid (column 4, line 13 through column 5, line 57).

As per claims 17 and 18, Edelman et al. teach said system and method wherein the system participates in load shedding and peak shaving (Abstract; column 1, line 56 through column 7, line 64).

As per claim 19, Chasek teaches said system and method wherein the data is selected from the group consisting of electricity prices, hydrocarbon prices, resource rate structure, power machine efficiency, power machine operating characteristics, futures prices, environmental data, regulatory rules, load demand, and weather (column 3, line 29 through column 5, line 58).

As per claim 22, Edelman et al. teach said system and method, further comprising monitoring the operational condition of the power machine (column 1, line 56 through column 7, line 64).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chasek and Edelman et al. in view of Norris et al. (US 5,510,780).

As per claim 21, Chasek and Edelman et al. teach all the limitations of claim 21, except for licensing of power machines.

Norris et al. teach a system and method for controlling a power generation equipment wherein said equipment is leased (column 1, lines 6-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chasek and Edelman et al. to include licensing of power machines, because it would increase the capability of the system thereby make it more attractive to the customers.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09/22/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that sited prior art do not teach a local control circuit for evaluating local data prior to actuating the power machine, examiner points out that Edelman teach said system and method comprising a turbogenerator which is controlled by a controller wherein said controller evaluates local data. Specifically, Edelman teaches that said controller provides both local control and sufficient intelligence to form a distributed processing system data (column 4, lines 8-10; column 6, lines 30-60 and discussion above).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Igor Borissov at telephone number (703) 305-4649.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 872-9306.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached at (703) 308- 2702.

Art Unit: 3629

Page 7

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

[Official communications; including After Final

communications labeled "Box AF"]

T B

JOHN G. WEISS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

per al

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600